26th February 1929]

A.—(*a*) & (*b*) G.O. No. 881, Revenue, dated 30th July 1885, did not lay down in the matter referred to any policy but an empirical rule devised, so far as can now be inferred, to produce a certain result in the case of the settlement of Madura in connexion with which settlement the Government Order was passed. When the next settlement, that of South Arcot, came under consideration, the absurdity of the proposed method as a means for arriving at a fair commutation rate for the next thirty years was apparent and that method was abandoned. No representations appear to have been received by Government in either connexion.

(*c*) No.

(*d*) The hon. Member is referred to the answer given to clauses (*a*) and (*b*).

Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu :—" Sir, is it not a fact that this Government Order laid down that all future resettlement operations should be carried on in consonance with the terms of this Government Order ? "

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" I must ask for notice, Sir."

Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu :—" May I know why Government changed the policy enunciated in this Government Order in regard to the resettlement of South Arcot ? The answer given here does not contain any answer to this point. The answer merely says it was found to be absurd. I want the reasons why it was found absurd. That is my intention in putting this question and I find no answer here to it."

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" To take the lowest price in any one year of the last twenty years as a fair commutation rate for the next thirty years is absurd."

Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu :—" If that was the policy laid down by the Government Order, where is the necessity for changing it ? "

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" Because the Government realized that it was absurd. (Laughter.)"

Mr. C. Ramasomayajulu :—" May I take it that the Government Order laid down an absurd proposal ? "

The hon. Sir Norman Marjoribanks :—" Yes, Sir. (Laughter.)"

Minor Irrigation

Transfer of minor irrigation supervisors.

*1469 *Q.*—Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udayar : Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that the minor irrigation supervisors are working in the same district throughout the period of their service ;

(*b*) whether the Government will be pleased to place on the table a statement showing the number of years each supervisor has been serving continuously in the districts of Trichinopoly, Tanjore, Madura and Tinnevelly ; and

(*c*) whether there are instances of these supervisors being transferred from one district to another in the interests of efficient administration ?

[26th February 1929

A.—(*a*) Unless transferred by the Board of Revenue for any reason, minor irrigation supervisors will ordinarily continue to serve in the district where they are.

(*b*) & (*c*) The information desired by the hon. Member is not readily available in any book of reference but would have to be specially compiled. The Government do not propose to order such compilation because as has already been stated in answer to questions on the subject of minor irrigation supervisors the Government think that ordinarily it is to the fuller advantage that they should serve in one district and not be transferred.

Irrigation of certain lands in Aralihalli village, Hospet taluk.

*1470 *Q.*—Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar: Will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether Survey Nos. 27-*a*, 27-*b*, 27-*c*, 28, 29-*a*, 29-*b*, 30-*a*, 30-*b*, 30-*c*, 12-*a*, 12-*b* and 12-*c* of Aralihalli village, Hospet taluk, Bellary district, are classified as wet lands in the Revenue registers and if so, the channel and the sluice intended to irrigate them;

(*b*) whether the said lands were for many years being irrigated by sluice No. 14; and

(*c*) whether irrigation from that sluice has since been prohibited and if so, why and from what date?

A.—(*a*) The Resettlement Register shows that the lands in question have been registered as wet under the Tungabhadra Anicut—Basavanna Kaluva. They are not registered as entitled to irrigation under a particular sluice.

(*b*) & (*c*) The Government have no information on these points.

Survey

Resurvey of Kasaragod taluk.

*1471 *Q.*—Mr. J. A. Saldanha: With reference to my question No. 229 answered on 8th September 1928, will the hon. the Member for Revenue be pleased—

(i) to place before the Council—

(*a*) the representation of the Landholders' Association of South Kanara at Mangalore and the orders passed thereon; and

(*b*) any subsequent orders as to the resurvey of Kasaragod taluk; and

(ii) to state the amount of the back assessment received, and

(*a*) liable to be refunded; and

(*b*) actually refunded under various headings according to the orders of Government?

A.—(i) (*a*) & (*b*) A copy of the order passed on the representation of the Landholders' Association of South Kanara was sent to the Honorary Secretary of that Association. Since then certain matters dealt with in that representation have been further examined by the Government, and orders have just been issued. A copy of these two orders [a] are placed on the table.

(ii) The Government have not the information.

[a] Printed as Appendix I on pages 166–170 infra.